

Serial No. 10/575,338  
Filed: April 10, 2006

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of the above application in view of the above amendments and the below remarks is requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are canceled. Claims 21-22 are new. Claim 6 has been amended.

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-20 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5 and 19 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of US 7, 255,972 in view of Sander et al (US 4,247,611). Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US 4,247,611). Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US 4,247,611) in view of Hatanaka et al (WO 03/087941). Claims 6 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US 4,247,611) in view of Pai et al (US 5,648,194). Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US 4,247,611). Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US 4,247,611) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Pai et al (US 5,648,194). Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US 4,247,611) in view of Hatanaka et al (WO 03/087941) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Pai et al (US 5,648,194).

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 29 2009

Serial No. 10/575,338  
Filed: April 10, 2006

The applicants have amended claim 6 to include and further define the element (E) and to include ratios of the components. Support for the ratio for A:B is present in the specification on page 10, support for the ratio for A:C is present in the specification on page 11, support for the ratio for A:D is present in the specification on page 12 and in Example 1 and 3, support for the ratio for A:E is present in the specification on page 13, and support for the ratio for A:F is present in the specification on page 16 and Example 3. Thus support for the values at each end of the ranges is present.

Support for new claims 21 and 22 are present on pages 15-16 of the specification.

The prior art cited by the Examiner does not show the specific ranges of concentration for each of the components as described in claim 6.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration of it is requested. If the Examiner disagrees, she is requested to contact the attorney for Applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Sangya Jain  
Reg. No. 38,504  
AZ Electronic Materials USA Corp.  
70, Meister Avenue,  
Somerville, NJ 08876  
Telephone: (908) 429-3536  
Customer No. 26,289